

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 093

JC 840 116

AUTHOR Kintzer, Frederick C.
TITLE Organization and Leadership of Two Year Colleges:
Preparing for the Eighties. Institute of Higher
Education Topical Paper.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher
Education.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *College
Administration; Community Colleges; Educational
Change; Educational Innovation; Participative
Decision Making; Private Colleges; Technical
Institutes; *Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

An analysis is presented of the organization and administration of public and private two-year colleges in the United States. Section I highlights the changes that took place within community colleges in the 1970's in budgeting, the expansion of collective bargaining, and the pressure to provide increased opportunities to minority students. Section II discusses structural models and organizational patterns of two-year colleges, focusing on two extremes: the bureaucratic model, which predominated for the first 50 years of community college development, and the participative model, which emphasizes lateral and oblique communication systems and faculty, student, and staff involvement in decision making. Section III provides a comparative analysis of organizational structures of two-year colleges in terms of administration, business functions, instruction, student services, and the executive function. This section examines the mode of organization and provides examples of: (1) public community colleges in single and multi-unit independent districts; (2) state university systems and branch campuses; (3) state boards for community colleges and state two-year college systems; (4) technical institutes and technical colleges; (5) colleges characterized by innovative patterns of organization, such as non-campus and cluster colleges; and (6) private colleges, including independent and church-related institutions. (HB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED241093

INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

James L. Wattenbarger
Director

Albert B. Smith, III
Assistant Director

December, 1980

ORGANIZATION AND LEADER-
SHIP OF TWO YEAR COLLEGES:
PREPARING FOR THE EIGHTIES

by

Frederick C. Kintzer

Professor
University of California at Los Angeles

Institute of Higher Education

TOPICAL PAPER

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. C. Kintzer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Y Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

JC 840 116

FOREWORD

Periodically we have found occasional papers which warrant wider circulation than is the usual case. We are fortunate in having this paper by Dr. Fred Kintzer (UCLA) available to add to the publications list of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida.

In this instance, Dr. Kintzer has provided an excellent overview of the situation currently present in community colleges in the various states. Further he has projected some 1980 needs and suggested ways of meeting them. We are indebted to him for his cooperation in making this report available to us.

Sections on structural models and organizational patterns, on comparative analysis dealing with both single and multi-unit districts, on branch colleges, on state board structures, on technical institutes, and on the noncampus colleges and cluster colleges make up the major portion of this report. A section on private colleges rounds out the coverage.

We know the reader will benefit from these comments and analyses.

James L. Wattenbarger

Gainesville, Florida
December, 1980

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES:

PREPARING FOR THE EIGHTIES

Frederick C. Kintzer

1980

I. Introduction

Forces emerging and gathering maturity in the last decade continue to influence the structure of two-year colleges. During the 1970s, increasing state government surveillance of public colleges led to a variety of patterns centered in state capitals, and a corresponding structural weakening of local units in financing and governance. Throughout the decade, public community colleges grew larger and more comprehensive in programming and services. Unified district colleges have been virtually eliminated, giving way to independent districts. Multi-units, groupings of local community colleges, have increased markedly while independent two-year colleges, often called "junior colleges," have not expanded. Unfortunately, many have ceased to operate.

The struggle for power through collective negotiations now mandated or permissive in many states has tended to alienate faculty and administration, and to cause structural change. Administration has become leaner as a partial result of unionization. Demands for unusual knowledge and expertise in managing bargaining and contract have led to innovation, giving rise to "human resources managers," "contract language specialists," and "grievance counselors." Managerial units, particularly in larger community college districts, now include groups of attorneys whose approval is sought by executives before major decisions are made.

Rulings of state boards known as exclusive bargaining agencies created to enforce contracts in some states have affected institutional structure. The National Labor Relations Board itself is responsible for important changes. For example, the NLRB ruling classifying departmental chairs as faculty and thus subtracting the group from the bargaining unit, has caused some colleges in California to reduce or eliminate departments in favor of divisions. The resulting additional pay rivaling administrator salaries is partial justification for including them on the management team. Collective bargaining legislation also affects structure. Since passage of the 1975 Rodda Act in California where "supervisor employee" was re-defined as management, many more supervisors have been appointed in community colleges.

Personnel to direct advanced financial management concepts; e.g., planning, programming, budgeting systems (PPBS) or zero-base budgeting, have been added to administrative teams. Diminishing resources and static or falling enrollments accent the need for institutional renewal. A variety of renewal systems designed to make more effective progress toward objectives have been introduced. Staff development specialists are now found on administrative rosters as least in part-time assignments. Institutional research units have been expanded particularly in multi-unit districts to fill the demands of accountability and renewal efforts.

Increasing pressure for budget control, systematic curriculum planning, personnel accountability, instructional precision, and learning delivery systems have all encouraged the use of managerial techniques, and popularized the terms "manager" and "management." This terminology has replaced "administrator" and "administration" in the vocabulary of

two-year colleges, particularly at the middle-levels of structural design. Because economic stability and systematic approaches are today's accents, educational leadership is focusing heavily on cost effectiveness and efficient marketing strategies.

Pressure from groups of potential students heretofore unserved by community and junior colleges is requiring major adjustments notably in the operation of students services. Now often referred to as "student development," this college function must accommodate the "new majority," part-time adults who have replaced the immediate high school graduate as the largest student group. Emeritus colleges and gerontology units have become popular in both urban and rural colleges. Career advancement centers often operated in cooperation with municipal services or independent agencies have been added, sometimes at the expense of traditional guidance-counseling personnel. In that regard, educational brokers have become extremely popular with adult groups due, in part, to an emphasis on client advocacy rather than institutional advocacy.

Federal and state legislation designed to provide opportunities for minorities has required the strengthening of both student services and business divisions. The property tax revolt heralded by Proposition 13 in California has caused traumatic organizational curtailments. Spiraling inflation continues to block programmatic and physical expansion, forcing closure of many private two-year colleges.

Other organization forms particularly at the middle management levels were initiated in the 1970s. Developed, in part, to answer changes of curricular irrelevance, inflexible teaching methods, and fiscal extravagance, "cluster colleges" and non-campus colleges" have gathered momentum. The former movement has introduced different

approaches to organizing and housing instructional and services programs; e.g., clustering self-sufficient units according to disciplines or geographic settings. The latter specializing in outreach programs, continues to experiment with non-departmental and non-divisional models of instructional administration.

This direction was noted in a 1970 investigation of current and predicted organizational changes in community colleges (Tillery, 1970). About 80 per cent of the presidents of 688 public two-year colleges participated in the comprehensive study. Many presidents saw structural change immediately ahead. Almost 40 per cent predicted changes in the administration of instruction. Colleges appeared to be moving away from departments and divisions toward interdisciplinary structures. Twenty percent predicted some type of clustering for the future.

These and other developments in the administrative-management structure of two-year colleges will be examined in Section III.

II. Structural Models and Organizational Patterns of Two-Year Colleges

The organization of two-year colleges falls within the extremes of two structural models: The bureaucratic and participational models. As depicted and described by Richardson, Blocker, and Bender (1972), the traditional bureaucratic model predominated in two-year colleges for the first 50 years of their existence. Policy developed by the board of trustees was translated into rules, and along with state and federal statute, communicated downward through divisional and/or departmental administration to the faculty and staff. Decisions were made autocratically for the most part, and responsibility was delegated through carefully defined administrative channels. Efficiency and orderliness were hallmarks, but the resistance to change and the stifling of

individual initiative which appeared to be inherent characteristics of the model became ineffectual in coping with the post World War II era.

The bureaucratic model was replaced by a form portrayed as participational. Interdependency replaced authority as the method of control for institutional behavior (Richardson, et al., 1972, p. 111).

Faculty, staff, and students became more influential in policy making and shared decision making responsibility. Community groups, apart from the formal boards of control, began to serve at least in advisory capacities. Lateral and oblique communications systems were encouraged. General administrators and area managers were generally limited to coordinating roles. Since leadership became a cooperative venture, organizational life was much more complex but at the same time, more vibrant and meaningful to the constituency.

While administrative responsibilities remained fairly constant in various organizational patterns, the distribution of these duties obviously differed. Quality and size of the administrative-managerial staff, institutional size, location and mission, student demography, structure of the state organization, and community environment all influenced how and where responsibilities were placed.

Sub-categories of public and private two-year colleges will be utilized for purposes of review and comparison in the next section. State systems and multi-unit districts will be examined. Innovative patterns, including examples of non-campus and cluster colleges, are discussed separately.

III. Comparative Analyses of Organizational Structure

While the past decade marked the end of explosive growth in American higher education, two-year colleges particularly public institutions

continued to grow primarily because of their general ability to adjust to the student market. The head count of two-year college full- and part-time students enrolled for credit continued to escalate, more than doubling in public colleges (from 2,051,493 in 1969 to 4,331,591 in 1979), and increasing approximately seven per cent in independent colleges (from 134,779 to 143,621). The disparity in numbers of public and independent continued, public colleges increased from 794 to 1,035 as independent colleges declined from 244 to 171 (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980, pp. 2-3).

Structural patterns concluding section II will be briefly reviewed and compared under the four service areas, administrative, business, instructional, and student services. The executive function will also be examined.

Public Colleges (Community Colleges)

Virtually all community colleges have been legally separated from public school systems. The independent district model is now widespread, and in recent years, state systems have grown both in number and complexity. Using marketing techniques to expand with the need, community colleges, both single and multi-unit district types, have continued to develop new functions and diversify traditional offerings.

Public Colleges (Single Independent Districts)

The vast majority of American two-year colleges are public. Most of these are organized as single independent districts and/or counties with separate taxing areas. While only a few states fully support their two-year colleges, state financial support and general domination is increasing at the expense of local support and authority.

The traditional functions of business, instruction, and student services are usually headed by vice-presidents and deans. In recent years, attention have been focused on the executive function, with emphasis placed on institutional planning and evaluation systems directed toward priority goal setting and more efficient fiscal management, and staff development. These occurrences, plus increasing control pressures from state capitals, management of collective bargaining contracts, and the changing institutional environment from a bureaucratic to a participational governance model, have fragmented the power of the executive.

The chancellor or president has become more like an undersecretary whose leadership is often confined to pre-ordained policies, rules, and regulations. To survive in the 1980s under a ministerial-type management style, the chief-executive must learn to adjust to a life of ambiguity (Cohen & Marsh, 1974).

Adaptations in administrative organization have accompanied the shift from bureaucratic to participational governance. In general, these represent attempts to bring the executive branch closer to the faculty and staff and to improve lateral communication between administrative offices. Recent changes in the Johnson County Community College (Kansas) administration illustrate an attempt to move in these directions. Modifications are based on two major operational tenets: participative or team management, and decision making at the lowest feasible level. The academic and operations branches each formerly headed by a vice-president have been replaced by a team of six equal administrators who work with the President and a provost. A group of five directors and two deans form the second-level team, each responsible for a major service. An elected representative congress coordinates the

activities of shared governance. Five college-wide committees of elected representatives report to the congress (Johnson County Community college, 1979-1980, pp. 1 and 4). The schematics are further suggestive of improvements to lateral communication which is a primary weakness of the bureaucratic governance model.

The unit college approach of Lansing Community College is also a decentralized organizational structure. The three major academic divisions, Arts and Science, Applied Arts and Science, and Business, act as semiautonomous units. Program planning and decision making is kept at the divisional level. An administrative assistant is provided each divisional dean. Processes and procedures differ, but in every unit, faculty involvement is emphasized to preserve diversification and flexibility. Authority balance is seen in the president's council. The Directors of Personnel and Public Relations, Business Manager, and divisional deans sit with the President and his assistant over college-wide issues and program coordination. The decentralized shared authority model, in its few years of operation, has proved to be as cost effective as centralization (Gannon, March 14, 1980).

A reorganization of administration at Foothill College (California) was recently announced to increase cost-effectiveness and operationalize a one-college philosophy. In the process, three full-time administrative positions and all associate dean-level positions were eliminated. Called a matrix model, managers were named as leaders of the five off-campus sites. The new managers report to the Deans of Administrative Services, Instructional Services, and Student Services where appropriate. Heads of the several academic and technical divisions, renamed managers, also share similar reporting responsibilities. While job descriptions

are similar, several major differences are clear. For example, the off-campus managers are responsible for the certified faculty and classified staff assigned to campuses, and the divisional managers, for all on- and off-campus instructional programs and for the initial screening of all new divisional certified and classified positions. The former are primarily site managers and the latter are program managers. However, a high degree of cooperation is anticipated and necessary between the two types of administrator/managers if the system is to progress effectively.

College-wide committees are becoming increasingly prominent in participational governance. At Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio) a multi-unit system, college-wide governance is highly developed. Three types of organizations, joint councils for faculty, staff, and students, joint committees on affirmative action, due process, etc. and a college forum for long range planning are coordinated by the Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost who is the chief operating officer of the district. Campus president/assistant provosts are campus educational leaders.

The popularity of external advisory committees have also grown and expanded. Special use is made of such organizations at John Wood Community College (Illinois). In addition to a citizen advisory committee directly associated with the president, groups from nearby proprietary colleges which have a programmatic contractual relationship with John Wood serve as advisors to the several deans and the college business manager.

Public Colleges (Multi-unit Independent Districts)

The multi-unit community college district has more than one institution. This arrangement obviously includes a district or headquarters

organization as well as a pattern for the individual members. A "multi-unit college" differs from a "multi-unit campus" in the degree of autonomy given to the institutions and the decentralization of administrative decision making practiced throughout the enterprise (Kintzer, et. al., 1969). Technically, the senior college and university systems found in a number of states and the state two-year college systems are also multi-unit. Member institutions in both patterns are usually more "multicampus" because less autonomy is generally granted by the parent (state) organization.

Although the first multi-unit districts were created in Chicago in 1934 and Los Angeles in 1945, there were only a few by 1960. This style grew rapidly from 10 multi-unit districts in 1964 to 40 in 1968. Currently, 66 with a total of 208 institutions are found in 22 states. California alone has 19 such districts with a total of 55 colleges. Except for those in Delaware, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and South Carolina, all are community or comprehensive colleges. Institutions in the first two states named above are called technical and community colleges, and those in the last two states are vocational-technical or technical colleges.

Mirroring the growing interest in participational management, most multi-unit districts reflect a decentralized or multi-college organization. With the deployment of functions to individual colleges, district offices have generally reduced the number of administrators. Sagging budgets and static enrollments have contributed to the reduction of district staffs. Along with the phenomenon of collective bargaining and tighter state surveillance, budget and enrollment conditions are contributing to a swing back to greater centralization and control at

the district. Systems are being centralized to prevent proliferation of curricula and services, cost duplication, and the loss of power.

An examination of a number of multidistrict organizational charts corroborates this direction. One indicator is the tightening of the district superintendent's or chancellor's control over college presidents and/or campus deans who report directly to the chief executive. While officers for instruction and student personnel or development are found in member institutions, these second-level campus officials report more often to educational planning and development executives or executive vice-chancellors in larger districts. For example, the Community College of Denver has recently employed a centralized vice-president for education program coordination to coordinate all programs and instruction of all campuses. In the Tarrant County Community College District (Texas) all non-credit and off-campus instruction is centralized under an organization named the "community campus" with a provost in charge. The Tulsa district has gone to a stronger centralized structure to control costs and overlapping of services. One aspect of this reorganization effort, however, has helped to preserve decentralized decision making. The Vice-President for Planning and Development is also the chief executive of one of the campuses. Greater operational responsibilities for running the campus are necessarily given to the Deans of Instruction and Student Personnel Services.

Personnel management, traditionally a district centralized function, has expanded under pressure for administrative cost effectiveness and consolidation. For example, the Vice-Chancellor for Educational Services in the San Jose (California) multi-unit district handles the traditional personnel functions, but through a series of personnel

officers, is responsible for coordinating education programs, personnel management, and affirmative action. The office is also responsible for collective bargaining and access to legal counsel. Thus, a powerful arm of the central administration is emerging to integrate academic and personnel coordination (Burns, 1979, pp. 13-20).

In states where collective bargaining is gathering momentum, a legal affairs office is necessary, often including a corps of full-time attorneys. Partially because of newness, this division may temporarily be identified as a separate entity. Such is the case in the Los Angeles Community College District. In the Maricopa County District (Arizona), the legal counsel reports to the Special Assistant to the Chancellor. In the St. Louis Community College District, the office of legal counsel is shown in a staff relationship both with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

Mention was made in section I of the recent expansion of learning delivery systems and instructional resources that now combine standard library collections plus multi-media materials, instructional development services, and centers for independent study. In multi-unit districts, coordination of that expanding service function is often provided by the central office staff. In the Dallas County Community College District a director of resource developments reports to the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Three colleges in the district have learning resource managers attached to college instructional services divisions.

Business management and public information have always been district responsibilities because the district administration is the legal fiscal authority. Comptrollers and financial aids officers continue to carry

abbreviated business and personnel responsibilities at the colleges. District leadership is also recognized in the areas of computer and data processing systems for management efficiency. Many multi-unit districts have on-line computers to centralize admissions and records for all campuses. Services directed specifically to students, counseling, advising, placement, health, and others remain largely college or campus responsibilities.

State University Systems and Branch Colleges

A total of 30 parent institutions, senior colleges and universities, and 103 member institutions called "colleges," "campuses," or "institutes" are presently scattered over 16 states. Ohio leads in the number of senior institutions (10) and individual schools (28). The University of Wisconsin Center System and the University of Kentucky Community College System each with 14 centers/colleges have the most branches. New York with extensive state university and city (New York) university systems, as well as a system of SUNY agricultural and technical colleges and community and junior colleges is the most complex of all state systems. In Alaska, Hawaii, Kentucky, and Nevada, all two-year colleges (called community colleges) belong to their respective university system.

In the four above-mentioned state university systems, the University President or Chancellor is legally the chief executive officer. Responsibility for the colleges in most situations is delegated to a vice-president or vice-chancellor. Although these community colleges do not differ significantly in their internal administrative structures from community colleges in independent local districts, structures external to the institutions and governance patterns differ sharply.

Presidents of colleges answer directly to university executives rather than to their own governing boards. Policy is established by university boards of regents not local district boards. In the last decade however, considerable flexibility has been allowed institutional presidents and local advisory boards to adjust organizational patterns to meet the needs of individual communities. In other words, the internal structure of these two-year institutions now differs according to local requirements. Honolulu Community College is structurally different than Kauai Community College; the administrative structure of Lexington Technical Institute (Kentucky) differs from that of Kentucky community colleges. Senior college and university branches are now considerably more community oriented in terms of structure and program.

Due in part to its farflung geography, the Alaska statewide system has maintained a three-region organization with community college presidents responsible to the regional chancellor. Colleges in Anchorage and Fairbanks have separate administrations but continue to share their respective university campus. The community college at Juneau, however, has recently been merged with the upper division formerly called Southeastern Senior College and graduate levels of the university under one chancellor. Beginning July 1, 1980 the Juneau-Douglas Community College became the JDCC division with a director instead of a president. The functions of the division are primarily for vocational-technical programs (both transfer and non-transfer) developmental education, and non-transfer community education. Other two-year colleges at Ketchikan, Kodiak, and other locations remain responsible to their respective area university chancellors. The smaller population of the Juneau area and the need to streamline administration were two principle reasons for

the amalgamation. The Juneau situation may well be an inviting pattern for returning once again to unified region or municipal systems in less populated areas to avoid overlapping services and to cut budgets.

The University of Wisconsin Center System campuses are considerably different. Historically designed to offer a two-year liberal arts transfer curriculum, the system has in recent years taken on a new vocational technical thrust. A chancellor heads the system and deans are campus leaders--a structural characteristic of a more centralized (multi-campus) pattern.

The key to vocational-technical education in Wisconsin is the vocational-technical and adult education system with 15 major districts. Three of the campuses at Madison, Milwaukee, and Rhinelander are allowed to have up to 25 per cent transfer students. These institutions are, in effect, community colleges.

Branch campuses of independent senior colleges and universities continue to upgrade administrative organizations. Among many others, the Ashtabula campus of Kent State University (Ohio) recently retitled its chief executive the Dean and assistants as directors.

State Boards for Community Colleges and State Systems

Increasing dominance of state government and corresponding weakening of local control is the most critical and far-reaching trend affecting governance and management of public two-year colleges. The drift toward state domination began with federal legislation. The National Defense Education Act (1951) designed to improve a variety of programs and services also spawned state level agencies and commissions to receive monies and monitor results. Other acts followed in the 1960s. The Vocational Education Acts of 1963 and 1969 and the Higher Education

Faculties Acts of 1963, 5, 7, and 9 all necessitated additional state bureaus. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the 1972 Higher Education Amendments further increased state level responsibility over postsecondary education. The latter legislation created perhaps the most important layer of state bureaucracy with respect to two-year college education--"1202 commissions" were established in every state to consolidate the coordination of all higher education under one agency (Bender, 1975, section II). Public two-year colleges, originally parented by local school districts, now became vulnerable to control by larger and larger units, including universities and state colleges, and state governments.

Currently, a total of 45 states have boards holding degrees of responsibility over public community colleges. Some include the original 1202 commissions. According to the most recent tally, 15 are responsible for community colleges only and the same number for all levels of education. Boards in five states are responsible for a university system including two-year colleges, and 10 for all higher education. Twenty-four of the 45 states have coordinating boards (Bender, 1975, p. 32, modified from Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi, 1971). Governing boards are legally charged with direct control and operation of institutions, coordinating boards do not have authority to govern but are legally responsible for organizing and regulating institutional policies and functions, and governing/coordinating boards have legal responsibilities for both activities (Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi, 1971, pp. 1-2).

Four of the 15 states with boards for community colleges only are referred to as governing: Connecticut, Delaware, Minnesota, and Vermont (Bender, 1975, p. 32). In these states to a greater extent than the 11

others, the state board for community colleges assumes a primary role in establishing and evaluating colleges, recommending budgets and allocating state funds, awarding and terminating appointments establishing tuition and fees, admissions regulations, grading policies, salary schedules, tenure promotion policies, and articulation agreements (Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi, 1971, p. 56).

Evidence in certain aspects of current state involvement suggests a trend toward a stronger governing posture. Continuing expansion of state authority has been a significant theme in all of the four annual review of state legislation prepared by Martorana and others. These comprehensive reports and analyses show a proliferation of both regulations and agencies assigned to enforce or coordinate regulations (also see Moody, 1978, pp. 39-62, and Gannon, 1978, pp. 75-97). Superboards for all of higher education add layers of bureaucracy that indirectly constrain flexibility of community college education. Articulation/transfer relationships show increasing appearance of state power in such states as Massachusetts, Washington, Virginia, Maryland, Illinois, and California. The Baccalaureate Compact developed in Illinois and rising pressure from the California Postsecondary Education Commission to take over articulation/transfer are specific examples (Kintzer, 1976).

Evidence of encroaching state power can also be inferred in an examination of institutional titles. Eleven states have two-year colleges which use "state" in their names. In eight, the state institutions are technical institutions or colleges (Alabama, Indiana, Maine, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin). Four (Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin) also have senior college or university

Branches. A few are even more complex. Wisconsin, in addition to the University Center System, has eight area technical institutes with a total of 24 campuses. These systems are coordinated by a state board responsible for all higher education.

The head of state board staff is usually called the "executive director." Various levels of directors follow. One reason for this terminology is to distinguish the state board staff from colleges. California, New York, and Virginia, among others use academic titles of "chancellor" and "president" and various traditional titles for subordinates.

Institutional funding is logically considered a pivotal source of power. Increases in state funding of community colleges were noted by Wattenbarger and Starnes (1973) as they identified state funding patterns. However, the Florida 100 per cent state-funding system continues to be a model of hope for community colleges which cherish local control but requires increasing amounts of state monies to survive (Owen, 1978, pp. 25-32). Kintzer's recent study of proposition 13 impact identifies that dilemma in a number of states (Kintzer, 1980).

A certain amount of state coordination is, of course, desirable to maintain some level of uniformity of programs and services, and in extreme situations, to prevent chaos. In any case, state-imposed operational strictures potentially exist in at least 10 areas: executive orders, lapsing and allotment procedures, accounting requirements, informational demands, contractual controls, enrollment demands, legal opinions, audits, programmatic controls, and budgetary controls (Mundt, 1978, p. 59). As in the case of collective bargaining, institutions must learn to live with increasing state control. Institutional

independence and local autonomy must be sacrificed to obtain beneficial aspects including a predictable and realistic funding formula. While legal encroachments are a constant threat to local control, a degree of flexibility is sometimes negotiable. Much depends on the attitudes of individuals in power. A cordial relationship can favor community college independence despite legal and operational constraints.

Technical Institutes and Technical Community Colleges

Technical institutes and/or technical community colleges are found in at least 25 states. These vary enormously in external structure. The six state systems of technical institutes or colleges were named previously. At least three others (Alabama, Iowa, and Nebraska) use the combination name "technical-community." Institutions in the Iowa and Nebraska were organized in areas along with Wisconsin which has eight such groupings. Vocational-technical branches of senior institutions are found in New York as agricultural and technical colleges in the SUNY system. Institutes in Maine and New Hampshire use the term "vocational-technical."

The internal organization of these institutions has remained fairly constant to match the continuing emphasis on technical and related education. Organizational charts indicate increasing interest in comprehensive curricula, including humanities, arts, and sciences. This is evident in the administrative hierarchy in subcategories of instructional divisions: "head of related studies" (Nashville State Technical Institute), "dean of arts and sciences" (Greenville Technical Institute, S.C.), and "chairperson, humanities department" (Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute, N.C.).

The Fashion Institute of Technology, although a specialized college under the program of the State University of New York, continues to be concerned with providing breadth experiences for all students. Liberal Arts is a prominent division headed by a dean.

The Nebraska area technical community colleges have had to develop administrative sub-divisions because of their large physical mass, covering many counties and municipalities. For example, the Central Technical Community College Area, actually a multi-unit district headquartered at Grand Island, has area vice-presidents as chief executives of the three area colleges. Rather than departmental or divisional leaders, each college has cluster chairpersons heading subject groupings; e.g., creative and social or science and health. Additional adaptations of the cluster organization will be discussed later.

The Indiana state system is an unusual organization. The 1963 legislation creating the Indiana Vocational-Technical College contained a unique combination of local (regional) and statewide responsibility. A president reports to the State Board of Trustees along with 13 regionally appointed boards of trustees. Vice-presidents/deans of the regional institutes and two other vice-presidents (treasurer and operations) report to the President of the College. A third Vice-President for Admissions was authorized in 1979.

As a sign of the times, a public relations counsel and legal counsel was recently made an assistant to the president, and the function of internal auditing, now guided by an internal audit committee meets directly with the President. Consolidations are also shown on the 1980 organizational chart. The offices of facilities management (maintenance, safety, space, utilization, etc.) has been moved to operations under

institutional planning and research. The function of information services was decentralized to the regions in 1978.

The Indiana system has not significantly increased its liberal arts general education programs, maintaining a strong emphasis on its technical concentrates. Program approval, which is subject to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the State Board for Vocational-Technical Education, is at times complex and difficult to predict. Despite these tensions and others involved in shared governance and administrative decision making, the state organization is highly regarded as a prototype vocational-technical system.

Innovative Patterns (Non-Campus Colleges)

Non-campus colleges are identified as non-traditional institutions that provide outreach programs in a variety of facilities scattered over the service area. While sometimes referred to as colleges-without-walls, non-campus colleges are different in that classroom and laboratory style teaching is emphasized rather than correspondence and independent study, and less attention is given to credits and degrees.

Eight of these institutions were identified in a 1977 study. A ninth, Community Campus of the Pima County Community College District in Arizona, was opened as the report was completed (Lombardi, 1977). Whatcom Community College (Washington) founded in 1970 is the only college in the legally-defined district. Community College of Vermont opened in 1971 as a single district institution but merged the next year with the Vermont State College system primarily for the purpose of gaining state support. Others, including Coastline Community College, Peralta College for Non-traditional Study, and Office of New Dimensions (now Los Angeles

Metropolitan College) all in California, Pioneer Community College in Missouri, and Chicago City-Wide College and Chicago Urban Skills Institute belong to multi-unit districts. The first and second-level administrative echelon are traditional. Executive heads called presidents (or vice-presidents in the Chicago institutions) report to the district chief executive who in multi-unit districts is uniformly a chancellor.

The second-level administrator is either a dean or director. Below that echelon, organizational patterns are individualistic, marking a shift from the traditional department/division system. Directors or facilitators replace departmental/divisional chairs with responsibility for all instruction and services in a geographical area or for a particular curriculum throughout the district. For example, area associate deans of the four geographic regions of Coastline Community College are responsible for all educational services. Area facilitators or special program coordinators report to them, and the associate deans to the college Dean of Instruction. Responsibilities are rotated among central and area office administrators to give opportunity to experience different aspects of the operation. This variety increases personal growth and sensitivity to instruction.

Rearrangement of student personnel services also characterizes non-campus colleges. Since the student body is almost entirely part-time, service facilities are minimal, student government and activities are usually attached administratively to community activities offices. At Coastline, the responsible persons are the Dean of Student and Community Activities and an Associate Dean of Community Services and College Activities. Counseling, often a limited role in non-campus colleges, is usually tied to a financial aids office.

From the start, Whatcom has had a conventional organization with a traditional line and staff relationship. The administrative organization of the Community College of Vermont is comparatively simple with a dean of the college (changed from "president" in 1979) and four area directors who, with central staff teams, support the delivery of services to students. A new position, Director of Administrative Services, was created in 1979 and the business office function was transferred to the state college chancellor's office. Field site teams on the four learning locations coordinate the actual learning environment. Each field site director is the chief administrative officer and program director of a particular instructional site, a much broader responsibility than practiced at Coastline in California and Pioneer in Missouri.

Innovative Patterns (Cluster Colleges)

Two-year colleges recognized as cluster colleges are composed of small semi-autonomous units organized on theme-characterizing units in the institution. Academic themes are found in most of the 25 to 30 institutions so-organized. Each unit in the Cypress College (California) "house plan" emphasized a particular discipline; i.e., humanities in Bernstein House, technical education in Edison House. Three sub-colleges, social and behavioral sciences, arts and humanities, and natural and physical environment comprise the Indian Valley Colleges (California) plan. Sub-units called "institutes" in South Oklahoma City junior College all have strong occupational emphases. Others are interdisciplinary; e.g., the Oakton Community College (Illinois) system provides an integration of transfer, occupational and general education in each unit. Some cluster colleges are organized around social problem themes and a few emphasize nationalities.

Decentralization is more prominent in colleges that are organized completely on a cluster plan, and centralization is more characteristic of institutions that are not entirely clustered. In the first case, clusters are expected to develop linkages to provide efficient and cost effective programs and services. In the latter, the cluster or clusters operating in a traditional system are required to follow institutional policies and to relate closely to the regular departments or divisions (Anthony, 1976, pp. 11-14).

A high degree of participational governance is practiced in colleges that have cluster units. Oakton Community College, College of Du Page, and Moraine Valley Community College (Illinois), Brookdale Community College (New Jersey), and Northampton County Community College (Pennsylvania) and others emphasize total involvement of constituencies. At Northampton, students are provided a special training seminar. At Indian Valley, decentralized councils represent cluster interests in a direct communication linkage to the president's office. The Los Medanos College (California) faculty, staff, and students make college policy through a complex committee system and the administrator group is committed to implementation (Heermann, 1974).

The administrative structure of the Los Medanos "in put-out put" governance model is considerably different. Several departures from traditional administrative titles and relationships are noted: (1) the president, five service managers, and four staff members form the Council for the coordination of management, (2) a flattened hierarchy shortens communication lines between the president, faculty, and staff, (3) four instructional management study areas each led by a dean replace divisions; subject matter groupings meet together informally but not as

departments, (4) while the Coordinator of Counseling is assigned to a particular study area, counselors as well as other student services officers are dispersed among the areas, and (5) since policy development by task forces of faculty, staff and students is delivered to the president through the educational policies committee, the president becomes the final authority in decision making. This clear determination to give decision making closure to the chief executive provides unity to the complex structure.

The model stresses maximum participation in policy forming, but within a complicated system of checks and balances, recognizes the ultimate priority of institutional will over individual determination. The instructional management format erases the traditional demarcation between transfer and occupational education and integrates day and evening and community services with curricular offerings and student activities. A general education core required of all students is thought of as an integrating force for the entire collegiate experience (Carhart & Collins, 1977).

Responsibility to participate fully in policy making places heavy demands on faculty time and energy, and in time the process becomes inordinately slow and cumbersome. However, a reasonable degree of satisfaction continues to be shown by employees of the college as well as the student body.

Oakton Community College shares similar eccentricities including the avoidance of departments and divisions. The five learning clusters are made up of heterogenous faculty groupings erasing the demarcation of transfer and occupational education. Learning cluster deans report to two general officers, to the Vice-President for Student Development

since they supervise teaching faculty, and to the Vice-President for Curriculum and Instruction since the deans supervise counselors. Instead of counselors, Oakton has student development faculty who are also members of the instructional staff.

Cluster deans in most cluster colleges are directly responsible for all of the internal functioning of the institution and actually serve as Deans of Instruction, Deans of Student Services, and Deans of the Faculty. These administrators are truly "middlemen" since they are accountable to chief executives in the parent organization and to faculties and students.

One of the first to open as a cluster college was the College of Du Page, another Illinois institution. Originally organized into four semi-autonomous small colleges, Du Page was an example of a "cluster" and a "non-campus college." Each of the self-contained units had pre-baccalaureate and occupational programs, guidance and counseling services, orientation toward community involvement, and a student life program. An extension division ran satellite centers in the community for the entire college reminiscent of a non-campus college. An alternative learning unit consisted of a learning laboratory complex, an independent study option (contact point for student information, including independent studies) the alpha one program (containing experience-based education in a "community of scholars" environment), and an instructional design unit to help faculty design and develop new courses and materials.

This elaborate system has recently been reorganized. The original cluster have been replaced with a two-college arrangement consisting of a main campus (a more traditional on-campus divisional pattern of academic groupings and a non-traditional unit called "Open Du Page." Assuming a more centralized system, provosts of these units and two vice-presidents,

(administrative affairs, and planning and information) report directly to the President. "Open Du Page" carries the work of the former extension division and the instructional design unit with a new emphasis on community-based learning. A temporary task force is currently defining the scope of the Du Page Open College. Its development bears watching.

Other cluster colleges are consolidating. Following the passage of proposition-13 in California the office of director of student services was eliminated in the Indian River Colleges' central administration and duties were combined with the office of educational services. Various areas of student services are now consolidated under half-time coordinators who have permanent staff positions. Because of exigencies of collective bargaining, the heads of the three colleges are now deans.

A cluster college or non-campus environment is conducive to innovation and experimentation. The chance to break tradition is often the prevailing attitude in a new venture. Although time consuming and exhausting, enthusiasm for change is, at least at the outset, relatively easy to maintain. However, the need for identity and acceptance is crucial, particularly in multi-unit systems where a new structure among traditional colleges may at first be suspect.

These institutional forms which emphasize smaller and less formal administrator-manager teams, part-time instructors, low cost facilities, and non-traditional approaches to curriculum building and instruction, are likely to grow throughout the 1980s.

Private Colleges (Independent and Church-related Institutions)

As organizations, private two-year colleges including both independent and church-related schools, have changed little in the last decade. Since in general they have continued charter commitments to the same

clientele, their goals and supporting functions have remained intact. Virtually all private institutions now call the chief executive "president," and in many cases, the title "vice-president" has replaced "dean" at the second-level. "Dean of the College" remains a favored title, possible because of programmatic similarities to small liberal arts senior colleges. This administrator often assumes the role of the president when the chief-executive is absent. Such an arrangement is so stipulated on the Chowan College (North Carolina) chart.

Other characteristics affect the composition of the organization. Religious life dominating church-related institutions requires a corresponding hierarchy. "Religious studies" is frequently a separate division under the Dean of the College. Ministers or chaplains are attached to the Dean of Students or to the President's office. Officers responsible for public relations, alumni, and gifts are also prominent. These usually report directly to the President.

Many private colleges are residential, and therefore have an appropriately designated staff. Larger institutions support more elaborate organizations. One of these, Ferrum College (Virginia) maintains a separate department of campus affairs, or a student relations department, both headed by a director. Assistants include a Director of Student Life, a Director of Leisure Services, residence hall directors, resident assistants and community advisors. In other colleges, the residential function is supervised through the office of the Director (or Dean) of Student Services. At Chowan College, the Director of Residence Life is at the associate level, answering to the Dean of Students. A similar relationship is found at Suomi College of the Lutheran school in northern Michigan. At Fischer Junior College (Massachusetts), residence

directors are also attached to student services. Alumni affairs is administratively related to student services. However, at Harcum Junior College (Pennsylvania) alumni relations appears to be a separate function.

Responsibilities for residence management, alumni affairs, and religious experiences are virtually non-existent in public community colleges. However, public institutions are beginning to show interest in endowments and other independent fund sources.

A departmental pattern of instructional administration is found more frequently than a division organization. This is, in part, a product of smaller student bodies and less complex instructional curricula. However, Becker Junior College (Massachusetts) is an example of a small institution with department division chairs as well as program coordinators. This more complex set-up is quite possibly the product of a two-campus pattern.

Independent a church-related colleges are also developing outreach programs away from the main campus. For example, Vincennes University (a longstanding two-year institution in Indiana) shows several centers in its organizational chart: Jasper Center and an occupational development center are both under the director of community services.

— — — — —

In summarizing organization and administration in the 1970 Handbook of College and University Administration, I commented that despite opportunity to do so, "two-year colleges have not, in general, shown enlightened leadership in developing new concepts of administrative organization and functioning" (Kintzer, 1970, 3-34). Best progress was being shown by larger institutions especially those forming multi-unit districts.

These observations are appropriate to summarize the decade. Innovative styles have for the most part evolved in urban and suburban areas of the country in the form of cluster colleges and non-campus colleges. Although not exclusively a two-year college invention, these patterns are geared to meet programmatic and service demands of the new majority of part-time adult students who are rapidly filling community college classrooms and laboratories. These forms also favor broader participation in policy making, and are considerably more cost effective. Problems and tensions notwithstanding, these organizational patterns can be positive signs for the future.

Collective bargaining which is now a fact in about one-third of all community colleges will continue to expand, causing internal administrative-management changes. The continuing demise of independent junior colleges is indeed an unfortunate loss.

The proliferation of state systems and the continuing shift toward state government control are again the most crucial organizational developments of the decade. This direction need not be considered entirely unfortunate. A certain level of coordination is necessary. The search for balance appropriate for individual states will continue to test the ingenuity of politicians and educators alike.

X2FK/G

References

- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1980.
- Anthony, J. "Reflections on a Cluster College." New Directions for Community Colleges, 13, 4:1, Spring 1976.
- Bender, L. W. The States, Communities, and Control of the Community College. Washington: AACJC, 1975.
- Burns, D. M. "Effective Personnel Administration - Better Utilization of Human Resources." New Directions for Community Colleges. 28, 7:4, 1979.
- Carhart, J. and Collins, C. Government: A Community College Model. Pittsburg, CA: Community College Press, 1977.
- Cohen, M. D. and Marsh, J. G. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Gannon, P. J. Lansing Community College: Unit College Approach, Lansing: Lansing Community College, March 14, 1980.
- Gannon, P. J. "Michigan at the Crossroads." New Directions for Community Colleges. 23, VI:3, 1978.
- Heermann, B. Organizational Break Through in the Community College. Topical Paper No. 47, Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, November 1974.
- Johnson County Community College. Charters of Accountability 1979-80. Overland Park, Kansas: J.C.C.C., 1979-80.
- Kintzer, F. C. Emerging Patterns of Statewide Articulation Transfer Agreements. Santa Monica: Pine Publications, 1976.
- Kintzer, F. C., Jensen, A. M., and Hansen, J. S. The Multi-Institution Junior College District. Washington: AACJC/ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Kintzer, F. C. Post-Proposition 13: Implications for Community Colleges. Topical Paper No. 72, Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, August 1980.
- Kintzer, F. C. "Organization for Administration of Two-Year Colleges." Handbook of College and University Administration. (Asa S. Knowles, ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, I:2, 1970.
- Lombardi, J. Non-Campus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs, Topical Paper No. 60, Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, March 1977.

- Martorana, S. V. (and others). State Legislation Relating to Community and Junior Colleges. Univeristy Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Reports 27 (1976), 31 (1977), and 33 (1978).
- Moody, G. V. "State-Local Partnership in Junior College Governance." New Directions for Community Colleges 23, VI:3, 1978.
- Mundt, J. C. "State vs. Local Control: Reality and Myth over concern for Local Autonomy." New Directions for Community Colleges. 23, VI:3, 1978.
- Owen, H. J. "Balancing State and Local Control in Florida's Community Colleges." New Directions for Community Colleges 23, VI:3, 1978.
- Richardson, R., Blocker, C., and Bender L. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Tillery, D. "Variation and Change in the Community College Organization." Programs in Community College Education and Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California, September 1970.
- Wattenbarger, J. L. and Sakaguchi, M. State Level Boards for Community and Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination. Gainesville: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, August 1971.
- Wattenbarger, J. L. and Starnes, P. M. State Funding Formulae for Public Two-Year Colleges. Gainesville: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, October 1973.

X2FK/G

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

APR 6 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024